

**IOWAccess Advisory Council Meeting  
Minutes of November 28, 2000**

**F i n a l**

- Present: Carol French-Johnson, Marsha Ternus, Greg Stevens, Marsha Carter, Kelly Hayworth, Richard Varn, Corlis Moody, Quent Boyken, Jane Ginapp, Richard Neri, Herb Strentz, Gail Flagel
- Absent: Libby Jacobs, Bob Dvorsky, Craig Hiemstra, Bob Skow, John Wellman, Steve King, Julie Shomshor
- Guests: Dan Combs, Diane Van Zante, Bill Haigh, Anissa Cowley

Carol French-Johnson opened the meeting by asking everyone to introduce him or herself, provide a bit of background, and identify the sector they represent on the council. Once introductions had been made, the council moved on to the meeting agenda.

- 1) Administrative Rules on Web Sponsorship (handout) - Rich Varn explained why this matter was being brought to the council's attention. Legislation states that any rule affecting IOWAccess must first pass through the IOWAccess Advisory Council for review and recommendation, prior to review and approval by the Information Technology Council. Income potential for IOWAccess is focused on three areas: a) fee for service, b) selling data, and c) sponsorship/advertising on state websites.

Dan Combs and Rich gave a PowerPoint presentation highlighting some of the other entities that utilize website sponsorship:

- Iowa basketball sites (UNI, ISU, and U of I)
- UNI accounting page
- Iowa tourism site
- IPTV (they receive support from a variety of sources and this is posted on their website)
- Cabela (Cabela pulls information from state DNR sites)

Dan mentioned that sponsorships/advertising are commonly found in the following areas: sports teams, trains, buses, airports, bus stops, beverage concessions, holiday displays, book covers, buildings, newspapers, software, score boards, yearbooks, scholarships, inaugurations, and many others.

Marsha Ternus said that some state government bodies (includes the Judicial Branch, probably such agencies as Civil Rights) will not want to participate in sponsorship as they are not permitted to receive money of any kind and there cannot be an appearance of any sort of impropriety/partiality. There should be no sponsorship of any government entity that has an adjudicatory responsibility.

Corlis Moody suggested that we would also need to address the issue of some entities trying to make a statement by placing an ad on a particular website. She gave the example of organizations who might want to place an ad on the Civil Rights website, simply because they oppose the concept of civil rights. Rich said state law does limit what we can do with state property, so we believe we can limit sponsorship to commercial entities only. The RFP puts the burden on the vendor to determine how to submit advertising consistent with the first amendment, as well as securing advertising that generates revenue.

Herb Strentz also mentioned the potential for advertisers to favor some websites and not others that may be considered less popular (such as those offering services to lower socio-economic or disadvantaged citizens).

Rich suggested that council members write down their comments and pass them on to the Information Technology Council.

Quent Boyken made a motion, seconded by Greg Stevens, that we accept the administrative rule as written and deal with the sticky issues through policy decisions.

Quent mentioned the possibility of having the RFP vendor make recommendations to each agency about advertising for their agency (as this would need to be approved by the individual agency). Rich stated that this was not currently what was envisioned. The only location that we are considering opening to sponsorship is the state portal site, not individual state agency sites.

All revenue generated by sponsorship would go to the IOWAccess revolving fund. Herb asked whether this could create a problem as a department might feel that they have the right to the money. It was noted that any department would have the right to choose not to participate in sponsorship. Rich mentioned the possibility of signing service agreements with the agencies, indicating that the money could be turned back to the agency.

Corlis feels that the need for revenue drives the whole process. If this is something that the citizens of Iowa want, it is up to the Legislature to determine how to fund it. Quent believes that it should be state appropriated.

Following a robust discussion, the council neither endorsed nor advocated sponsorship of state web pages. The Chair asked for a verbal vote to approve the administrative rule. All those in favor signified with an aye. There were no opposing votes.

- 2) 100% E (handout - appendix labeled I2) - Potential digital government applications include: voting, renewing your driver's license, renewing vehicle registration, professional license renewal, etc. (a more extensive list is found on the handout). The

State needs to build an infrastructure (architecture, standards, security, etc.) to support the creation of these applications. There are many more technology projects than the State can actually fund.

- 3) Overview of ROI Projects – The ROI (return on investment) pooled technology summary was distributed to council members. It shows the current list of projects, the Information Technology Council’s rankings, and associated dollar amounts. There are additional projects that are not on the list, such as corporate filings. Rich asked which projects found on the I2 appendix, but not listed on the ROI summary, that the council felt still needed to occur in order to improve services to Iowa citizens? The ROI forms filled out by the agencies for each project help us in three ways: a) to understand the project, b) the hard return on investment, and c) the benefits to Iowa and its citizens. What does the council see as essential projects that need to be completed?

Rich identified the projects from the list that are part of the digital government initiative:

- #20 DRF – Enhance Electronic Tax Administration
- #9 IWD – Automate the Unemployment Insurance Services Tax System
- #11 DPD – Emergency Management (Electronic Transaction & Forms Mgmt.)
- #18 IDALS – E-Commerce – Electronic Licensing

Quent feels that we need to prioritize applications that citizens will really use so that citizens become more accustomed to using the Internet and choose to use it more frequently. Increased usage will also affect the problems associated with generating revenue. Quent identified several items from Appendix I2 that he sees as priorities:

- renew driver’s licenses
- business registration
- business licensing
- UCC filings
- voter registration
- obtain birth, death & marriage certificates
- criminal history lookup
- renew professional licenses
- personal tax filings
- pay taxes, receive refunds
- annual corporate filings
- obtain information to make park reservations
- fishing/hunting licenses

Additional comments from the council on other items that should receive priority are welcome.

Dan was asked to compile a list of ongoing projects to be routed to the council so that they know which ones are ongoing and can then recommend others that they would like to see move forward.

- 4) Customer Feedback Mechanisms – Currently, we do not have any formal customer feedback mechanisms, but are looking at creating some. The ITD Help Desk receives questions that do come in. What kind of customer feedback mechanism should we utilize and what do we want to measure? We are considering putting a mechanism at the bottom of every application page that registers the savings realized in time and money by the people who use the online service. Quent suggested a poll asking citizens if they would use the Internet to renew their driver’s license, as well as other transactions. This would also be good information for the legislature. It is important to include Internet users as well as non-users. Corlis suggested polling at the place of service, such as asking people at the driver’s license station if they would take advantage of the opportunity to renew online. This type of polling might yield a higher rate of return than simply offering a poll on a website. Carol asked Dan to provide a list of options in regard to feedback mechanisms and then the council could make a recommendation.
- 5) FY 99 and 00 Audits – The law requires that we have an audit of the IOWAccess program annually to assure compliance with the law and look for any misappropriation or misuse. This handout highlights the results of the FY99 and FY00 audits. In short, no evidence of misuse or misappropriation was found.
- 6) Iowa Interactive Relocation – Rich announced that the Iowa Interactive group (four individuals who now work under contract for ITD) is moving to another location on SW 7<sup>th</sup>.
- 7) Wrap-up – Carol identified the items that the council needs to work on prior to the next meeting (previously identified in the minutes). Rich stated that once the Governor approved the 100% E report, it would be shared with the IOWAccess Advisory Council. Diane asked those who wanted to submit travel claims to stop and pick up a form before leaving the meeting.